

EVALUATION FORM  
Julian Branch Library (1046)

***Population Growth - 1980 to 2020***

***FORM AA***

Regulatory Basis: p.35, 20440, Appendix 1

**Rating Panel Comments**

**154.1%**

EVALUATION FORM  
Julian Branch Library (1046)

***Age of Existing Library***

***FORM A***

Regulatory Basis: p.37, 20440, Appendix 1

**Rating Panel Comments**

The library was built in 1888 and renovated in 1971.

**Rating Basis:**

4 = No Existing Facility

3 = 1957 or older

2 = 1958-1962

1 = 1963-1974

0 = 1975-Present

RATING:

**Date of Most Recent Structural Renovation**

**Rating Basis:**

4 = No Renovation

3 = 1957 or older

2 = 1958-1962

1 = 1963-1974

0 = 1975-Present

RATING:

4 = No existing library/renovation  
 3 = Poor Condition  
 2 = Acceptable Condition  
 1 = Good Condition  
 0 = Very Good Condition

# EVALUATION FORM

## Julian Branch Library (1046)

### Condition of Existing Public Library

### FORM B

Regulatory basis: p.37, 20440, Appendix 1,  
 p.64, 20440, Appendix 3, 8(a)

RATING:

#### Rating Panel Comments

Current library is in a former 1-room school built in 1888.

Lighting is not addressed.

Current facility housed in historic single room built in 1888. Renovated and moved to current site in Julian in 1971. Does not meet ADA and County health and safety standards - inadequate space, heating and ventilation. No separation between functional areas - everything in one space. Parking inadequate. Building is a County Historic Landmark and, as such, cannot be physically expanded.

The current library is housed in a converted one-room 1888 school house with an historic designation, precluding major renovation. Major deficiencies of the existing library: inadequate HVAC (window units) causing closure of the library when internal temperatures exceed 90 degrees in the summer; non-compliance with ADA and seismic codes; inadequate acoustical control; inadequate space flexibility; and the slope of site precludes access except by automobile. Based on visual record (video), lighting appears to be adequate.

#### Factors Considered:

Structural

Lighting

Energy

Health & Safety

ADA

Acoustical

Flexibility

Spatial Relationships

Site Considerations

Total

R1	R2	R3	R4
4	4	3	4
4	4	0	2
4	4	4	4
4	4	3	3
4	4	4	4
4	4	4	4
4	4	4	4
4	4	4	4
4	4	3	4
36	36	29	33
4.0	4.0	3.2	3.7

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Julian Branch Library (1046)

### Community Library Needs Assessment

**FORM F**

RATING:

Regulatory Basis: p.26, 20440 (d) (2) and p.61, 20440, Appendix 3

#### Rating Panel Comments

Good demographics and lots of emphasis on needs of K-12 - a rural project.

Needs Assessment process began in 1996 and culminated in 2001. Methodology consisted of surveys, town hall meetings, interviews and included all relevant community organizations, residents, school district representatives, government agencies, etc. Analysis of service needs is thorough and related to demographic data provided. Service limitations are addressed and it is clear the current facility cannot provide collection, technology or program resources to meet the needs of this community with a growing school population, many of whom are economically disadvantaged. K-12 needs are delineated well.

The needs assessment process include a broad range of methods by which community input was gathered, including key informant interviews, written surveys, focus groups and "town hall" meetings. Key government and community organizations were identified and included in the process. Analysis of demographic data leads to logical library service needs conclusions.

#### Rating Basis:

1. Methodology & Community Involvement.
2. Community Analysis/Community agencies & organizations, service area.  
demographics
3. Analysis of service needs/consistency with demographics.
4. Service limitations for existing facility (if applicable).
5. Space Needs Assessment.
6. Needs of K-12 Student Population, if applicable.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	4
2	4	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	3
4	4	4	4	4
5	4	4	4	3
6	4	4	4	3
Totals	24	24	24	21
	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.5

- 4 = Outstanding
- 3 = Very Good
- 2 = Acceptable
- 1 = Limitations
- 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Julian Branch Library (1046)

### Library Plan of Service

### FORM G

Regulatory Basis: p.67, 20440, Appendix 4

RATING:

#### Rating Panel Comments

Plan of Service contains a great deal of information about the Homework Center.

The Plan of Service is well written. Needs identified include a larger facility, which is the educational, recreational resource in the community. The collection needs, including local history of the Gold Rush era community, the school homework center support, computer skills training for the entire community, Internet access, space needs, are all addressed. Mission Statement is that of the County Library's. However, goals, objectives and service indicators are specific to needs identified in the Julian community, and are each discussed in detail. The joint venture project - The Homework Center, will be open during all open library hours. This is a 1st priority branch facility project (CIP) for San Diego County Library.

The plan of service is well written. Needs identified include a larger facility, which is the educational, recreational resource in the community. The collection needs, including local history of the Gold Rush era community, the school homework center support, computer skills training for the entire community, Internet access, space needs, are all addressed. Mission Statement is that of the County Library's. However, goals, objectives and service indicators are specific to needs identified in the Julian community, and are each discussed in detail. The joint venture project - The Homework Center, will be open during all open library hours. This is a 1st priority branch facility project (CIP) for San Diego County Library.

#### Rating Basis

- 1.How Project responds to Needs of Residents.
- 2.How well mission, roles, goals, objectives, service indicators are documented.
- 3.Types of services well documented.
- 4.How project fits into jurisdiction-wide Plan of Service.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	4
2	4	4	4	4
3	4	4	4	4
4	4	4	4	4
Totals	16	16	16	16
	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Julian Branch Library (1046)

### Library Building Program

### FORM H

Regulatory Basis: p.69, 20440, Appendix 5

RATING:

#### Rating Panel Comments

While Building Program implements general Plan of Service, it does not implement joint venture as described. The Building Program does not include the description of "Homework Center" - the joint venture. The reader service area description includes mention of 12 PC stations, six of which are included in the Homework Center Joint Venture. Another three are listed in the children's area space description as belonging to the joint venture. Two study rooms are provided for student and general use.

The building program does not adequately implement the needs assessment. The general requirement section includes very little about telecommunication needs, referring the reader to a section that doesn't exist. The needs assessment emphasizes the Homework Center, but almost nothing is included about it in the building program. The 12 PCs mentioned for homework center are mentioned in conjunction with and divided among other spaces, and only 9 were located. Shelving is not included in the master list of furnishings and equipment. A separate shelving appendix is included, but it doesn't specify quantity needed -- only capacities of various shelving types. Also, shelving is not included in the individual space descriptions, leaving the designer to attempt to interpret what type and height of shelving the applicant requires in each area.

#### Rating Basis:

- 1.How well Building Program implements Plan of Service.
- 2.How well Building Program documents general requirements for Library Building.
- 3.How well are the Spatial Relationships described.
- 4.How well are individual spaces sized and described.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	1	4	4	1
2	2	4	4	2
3	2	4	4	3
4	2	4	4	3
Totals	7	16	16	9
	1.8	4.0	4.0	2.3

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Julian Branch Library (1046)

### Conceptual Plans

### FORM I

Regulatory Basis: p.27, 20440 (d) (5)

RATING:

#### Rating Panel Comments

The Homework Center which is the basis of this joint venture is not a separate room -- it's just an area of tables. For the kinds of activities they plan, this doesn't seem adequate.

Elevations do not show program areas.

There are three Homework Center designations but only selected number of computers in each chain are Homework Center designated (according to the Building Program). There is no separate Homework Center, per se. The PC's are in an open area in the Children's and Young Adult/Adult sections. Non-assignable square footage is given as total on legend - not per space.

The plans follow most of the requirements of the building program, with the exception of the reference area where the architect appears to have read the building program and divided the reference area, locating it in more than one area in the building instead of in a single area. Programmed square footage is not shown on the floor plan, requiring the reader to cross reference the building program to verify the plan. Actual square footage is given only for major divisions, not for individual spaces. The building program called for approximately 17% non-assignable square footage, but the floor plan shows approximately 7%, which may be inadequate to accommodate the building functions.

#### Rating Basis:

- 1.How well the net-assignable square footage on plan matches BP, PoS and NA
- 2.How well the non-assignable square footage on plan matches BP, PoS and NA
- 3.How well Spatial Relationships on plan match what was called for in BP, PoS, and NA
- 4.How well the elevations, sections and specification implement the BP and PoS

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	2	4	4	2
2	1	4	4	1
3	2	4	4	2
4	2	4	3	2
Totals	7	16	15	7
	1.8	4.0	3.8	1.8

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Julian Branch Library (1046)

### Joint Use Cooperative Agreement

**FORM J**

Regulatory Basis: p.60, 20440, Appendix 2

RATING:

#### Rating Panel Comments

School District's are donating the library site and \$10,000 for materials.

School district donates the land to library contingent on grant award. School district may fund additional staffing beyond that provided by the County.

There are 2 Agreements between the County and the Julian Elementary School District and High School District, respectively. Onus is on the County for staffing and funding commitments with the exception of a first year, \$10,000 allocation from the Elementary School District. Heavy use of volunteers suggested. District's commitment appears to be "encouraging students" to become volunteers. Review/modification process is annual, although there is a provision for a Student Advisory Council to assist in materials selection and program planning. Weak Agreement.

Joint use agreement: Homework Center The agreement indicates that the school district is donating the land for the library, will provide funds toward the opening day collection, and "may" transfer the school library collection to the new library. The county will provide all other funding required to staff and operate the completed facility. The agreement indicates only that the school district "may" provide staffing but that it will be "subject to a mutual written agreement of both the School District and the County based upon adjustment of costs and related policies." The description of services to be provided is very thorough and appropriate to the needs assessment findings.

#### Rating Basis:

1. How well roles & responsibilities are defined.
2. How clearly are the joint library services described.
3. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of hours of service.
4. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of staffing/volunteers.
5. How well are ownership issues resolved.
6. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of sources & uses of funding
7. Appropriateness, adequacy, reasonableness of review & modification process.
8. How well the agreement demonstrates a workable, mutually beneficial long term partnership.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	2	4	4	3
2	2	4	3	4
3	2	4	4	3
4	1	3	3	2
5	2	4	4	4
6	1	3	4	2
7	1	4	4	2
8	1	3	3	2
Totals	12	29	29	22
	1.5	3.6	3.6	2.8



4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Julian Branch Library (1046)

### Joint Use: Needs of K-12 Students

### FORM K

Regulatory Basis: p.67, 20440, Appendix 4

RATING:

#### Rating Panel Comments

The emphasis in this project is on K-12 needs.

The project responds to K-12 needs identified. There is a lack of resources for students within the service area and students have to be bused 55 miles to a regional branch in order to find necessary resources to complete homework assignments. The joint venture proposed will provide K-12 students with the necessary electronic and print resources for educational growth and learning.

The needs assessment process included all residents but paid particular attention to the needs of K-12 students. The plan of service responded appropriately by providing a homework center with both print and electronic reference sources.

#### Rating Basis:

1. How the project responds to the needs of the K-12 students as expressed in Needs Assessment.
2. How well the mission, roles, goals and objectives are documented.
3. How well documented are the types of K-12 services.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	3
2	3	4	4	3
3	3	4	4	3
Totals	10	12	12	9
	3.3	4.0	4.0	3.0

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Julian Branch Library (1046)

### Integration of Electronic Technologies

**FORM L**

Regulatory Basis: p.68, 20440, Appendix 4

RATING:

#### Rating Panel Comments

The technology plan provides for an infrastructure upgrade, which will integrate with the existing County Library's automated services and which will extend public computerized services - 12 PCs in Homework Center for word processing, graphics, Internet, OPAC, online database access (specialized for student related needs). No mention of wireless technology or laptops.

The implementation of electronic technology is stressed throughout the planning documents and is of significant importance to this isolated community. Specific technology uses include: Internet access; access to the county library's database subscriptions for students and general clientele; software applications for use by students in completing homework assignments; a homework center with 12 PCs.

#### Rating Basis:

1. Appropriateness of the electronic technologies in Plan of Service, based on Needs Assessment.
2. How well the integration of electronic technologies is documented in the Plan of Service.
3. How well the integration of electronic technologies is in the Building Program.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	2	4	4	4
2	2	4	4	4
3	2	4	4	4
Totals	6	12	12	12
	2.0	4.0	4.0	4.0

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Julian Branch Library (1046)

### Appropriateness of Site

### FORM M

Regulatory Basis: p.39, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING:

#### Rating Panel Comments

Centrally located within library service area and to surrounding commercial and residential areas.

The proposed site is located on property that has been donated by the school district, and it is adjacent to three of the community's five public schools. It's centrally located in the service area and is surrounded by both residential and retail areas, and is located in close proximity to the two major arterial routes in the area. There is a rural route bus stop within 1/4 mile of the site. Community master planning discourages the development of sidewalks because of the desire to maintain the rural character of the community. The shared parking agreement provides a maximum of 33 spaces, but the application documentation indicate that 63 spaces are provided by the agreement, showing a misunderstanding between the parties or clerical errors in the application documents.

#### Rating Basis:

1. Equal Access for all residents in Service Area.
2. Accessibility via Public Transit.
3. Accessibility via Pedestrian and Bicycle.
4. Accessibility via Automobile.
5. Adequacy of Automobile Parking.
6. Adequacy of Bicycle Parking.
7. Overall Parking Rationale.
8. Shared Parking Agreement (if applicable).
9. Visibility of site and proposed library building in service area.
10. How well site fits community context and planning.
11. Site selection process and summary.

	R1	R2	R3	R4
1	4	4	4	3
2	3	2	3	3
3	4	4	2	2
4	4	4	3	4
5	3	4	4	2
6	3	3	4	2
7	3	4	3	2
8	3	4	4	4
9	4	4	4	4
10	4	4	4	4
11	4	4	4	4
Totals	39	41	39	34
	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.1

4 = Outstanding  
 3 = Very Good  
 2 = Acceptable  
 1 = Limitations  
 0 = Serious Limitations

# EVALUATION FORM

## Julian Branch Library (1046)

### Site Description

**FORM N**

Regulatory Basis: p. 45, 20440, Appendix 1

RATING:

#### Rating Panel Comments

The site of the library is adjacent to the Julian High School. Land donated by School District.

Design plan will exceed Title 24 energy requirements by 10%.

The site size is adequate and shouldn't present design or siting problems.

#### Rating Basis:

1. Adequacy of size of site.
2. Drainage problems.
3. Geotechnical problems.
4. Appropriateness of site configuration (Boundary Survey)
5. Appropriateness of site/surrounding area. (Visual Record)
6. Appropriateness of site based on placement of building, parking, access roads, pathways, expansion and parking.

	R1	R2	R3	R4	
1	3	4	4	3	
2					OK
3					OK
4	3	4	4	3	
5	3	4	4	3	
6	2	4	4	3	
Totals	11	16	16	12	
	2.8	4.0	4.0	3.0	

EVALUATION FORM  
Julian Branch Library (1046)

***Financial Capacity***

***FORM O***

Regulatory Basis: Bond Act p. 5, Section 19998 (a) (7)

**Rating Panel Comments:**

Applicant has committed to the on-going operation of the completed library.

EVALUATION FORM  
Julian Branch Library (1046)  
Ratings Summary

<b><i>BOND ACT CRITERIA</i></b>	<b><i>RATING</i></b>	
Population Growth		<b>154%</b>
Age and Condition	3.4	
Needs of residents/response of proposed project to needs	3	
Plan of service integrates appropriate technology	4	
Appropriateness of site	3	
Financial capacity (new libraries only)		<b>yes</b>